

REMARKS

In view of the above supplemental amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

I. Amendments to the Claims

By this Supplemental Amendment, independent claims 35, 39 and 40 have been further amended to make various editorial corrections and clarifications.

II. 35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejection

Claims 28-34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Takeda. This rejection is considered moot based on the above-mentioned cancellation of claims 28-34. Further, this rejection is believed clearly inapplicable to claims 35-40 for the following reasons.

Independent claim 35 recites method of using an information processing apparatus. Specifically, claim 35 recites that the method includes:

- (1) specifying item definition data that defines a corresponding item name, as first tag information, for each of a plurality of data-fields, each respective data-field being a rectangular area in which data associated with the corresponding item name is written, the corresponding item name for each of the plurality of data-fields being defined by recognizing, as a data-field that corresponds to the corresponding item name, a set of cells having a specific relation to a term representing the corresponding item in a form of a character string to which specific marking information is added on the table format;

- (2) specifying difference condition data, as second tag information, for a data-field for which a first item name is defined, the difference condition data being defined for the data field (for which the first item name is defined) based on inputted specific information added to the corresponding data-field having the specific relation to the data-field (for which the first item name is defined), the difference condition data defining a difference between data input conditions of first and second kinds of unitary data areas, which are each a rectangular area in which single data is written, included in the corresponding data-field, wherein first constituent data of the difference condition data specifies the difference, regarding data of a second item name registered in the difference condition data as second constituent data, between the first and second kinds of the unitary data areas, and wherein the data of the second item name constitutes the data input conditions for the first and second kinds of the unitary data areas along with data of item names other than the first item name;
- (3) recognizing two kinds of unitary data areas in the data-field for which the first item name is defined, the two kinds of unitary data areas being recognized based on inputted specific information added to the corresponding data-field and cell data for the corresponding data-field, wherein the inputted specific information is attached to the second kind of the unitary data area with the specific relation; and
- (4) outputting data from a source data file into a unitary data area included in the corresponding data-field for which the first item name is defined, the outputting of the data being defined by the following sequence (4a) generating a first record, which is a combination set of data associated with each item name, as the data input condition of a unitary data area if the unitary data area is of the first kind, wherein each data

constituting the first record is read from a cell in each of the plurality of data-fields, each cell (from which the data constituting the first record is read) having a specific positional relation with the unitary data area of the first kind, (4b) generating a second record, which is a combination set of data associated with each item name, as the data input condition of the unitary data area if the unitary data area is of the second kind, the second record being generated by changing data associated with the second item name constituting the first record, based on the first constituent data, of the difference condition data, representing the specified difference regarding the data of the second item, (4c) comparing each record that is fetched from the source data file with a corresponding data input condition of the unitary data area, the corresponding data input condition being the second record when the unitary data area is of the second kind, and the corresponding data input condition being the first record when the unitary data area is of the first kind, wherein each data that constitutes a data file record, of the source data file, associated with each item name other than the first item name, is judged to be equal to or included by the data that is associated with a same item name constituting the first record or the second record, and (4d) outputting the data associated with the first item name that constitutes a selected data file record to the unitary data area, wherein the selected data file record is selected based on a condition that the judgment is obtained for each item name considered by the comparison.

Takeda fails to disclose or suggest the above-mentioned distinguishing features as recited in independent claim 35.

Rather, Takeda teaches outputting data into a field by interpreting a specific term or character string related to the field, based on a specific relation, and teaches outputting data associated with an item name into a selected area (from among a plurality of areas of one data-field cell) based on a position of a corresponding item name that is written in a cell related to the specific relation (see col. 34 line 62 to col. 35, line 5; and col. 23, lines 56-68).

Thus, in view of the above, even though Takeda teaches that data associated with an item name is output to an area selected based on a position of a corresponding item name and a specific relation, Takada still fails to disclose or suggest (2) specifying difference condition data, as second tag information, for a data-field for which a first item name is defined, the difference condition data being defined for the data field (for which the first item name is defined) based on inputted specific information added to the corresponding data-field having the specific relation to the data-field (for which the first item name is defined), the difference condition data defining a difference between data input conditions of first and second kinds of unitary data areas, which are each a rectangular area in which single data is written, included in the corresponding data-field, wherein first constituent data of the difference condition data specifies the difference, regarding data of a second item name registered in the difference condition data as second constituent data, between the first and second kinds of the unitary data areas, and wherein the data of the second item name constitutes the data input conditions for the first and second kinds of the unitary data areas along with data of item names other than the first item name, as recited in claim 35.

In addition, for reasons similar to those discussed above, Takeda also fails to disclose or suggest (4b) generating a second record, which is a combination set of data associated with each item name, as the data input condition of the unitary data area if the unitary data area is of the

second kind, the second record being generated by changing data associated with the second item name constituting the first record, based on the first constituent data, of the difference condition data, representing the specified difference regarding the data of the second item, as recited in claim 35.

Therefore, because of the above-mentioned distinctions it is believed clear that independent claim 35 and claims 36-38 that depend therefrom are not anticipated by Takeda.

Furthermore, there is no disclosure or suggestion in Takeda or elsewhere in the prior art of record which would have caused a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify Takeda to obtain the invention of independent claim 35. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 35 and claims 36-38 that depend therefrom are clearly allowable over the prior art of record.

Independent claims 39 and 40 are directed to an apparatus and a program, respectively and each recite features that correspond to the above-mentioned distinguishing features of independent claim 35. Thus, for the same reasons discussed above, it is respectfully submitted that claims 39 and 40 are allowable over Takeda.

III. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance and an early notification thereof is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Mantaro YAJIMA

/Andrew L. Dunlap/

By 2009.12.30 16:21:11 -05'00'

Andrew L. Dunlap

Registration No. 60,554

Attorney for Applicant

ALD/led
Washington, D.C. 20005-1503
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
December 30, 2009